

10/53910

24 JUN 2005

PCT

10/53910



REC'D 15 JUN 2005
WIPO PCT

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT (PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 00125	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/EP 02/14777	International filing date (day/month/year) 27.12.2002	Priority date (day/month/year) 27.12.2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F3/023		
Applicant NOKIA CORPORATION et al.		

- This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
- This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.  
  
☒ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).  
  
 These annexes consist of a total of 5 sheets.

- This report contains indications relating to the following items:
  - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
  - II ☐ Priority
  - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
  - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
  - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
  - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
  - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
  - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand  05.12.2003	Date of completion of this report  14.06.2005
Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:   European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Authorized Officer  Van de Maele, L  Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8805  

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY  
EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No. **PCT/EP 02/14777**

**I. Basis of the report**

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)*):

**Description, Pages**

4-22 as originally filed  
1-3, 3a received on 03.09.2004 with letter of 30.08.2004

**Claims, Numbers**

2-39 as originally filed  
1 received on 03.09.2004 with letter of 30.08.2004

**Drawings, Sheets**

1/8-8/8 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).  
☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).  
☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.  
☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.  
☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:  
☐ the claims, Nos.:  
☐ the drawings, sheets:

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY  
EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No. **PCT/EP 02/14777**

---

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

*(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)*

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

**V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-39
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-39
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-39
	No: Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations**

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-1 035 712 (NOKIA MOBILE PHONES LTD.) 13 September 2000  
(2000-09-13)

D2: US-A-4 500 955 (CHANG) 19 February 1985 (1985-02-19)

1. A mobile terminal according to the features of the preamble of claim 1 is already known from D1 (abstract and page 3, paragraph [0018]).

The features of the characterising part of claim 1 relate to the problem of reducing the size of words entered by the user (see description, page 2, lines 17 to 22) for the purpose of saving storage space or reducing transmission load.

Document D2 also addresses this problem (D2, column 1, lines 28 to 41) and proposes the same solution as defined by said features of claim 1. More in particular, those words of a text which have a match in a dictionary (D2, word table) are replaced by their reference in that dictionary (D2, column 5, lines 43 to 47) whereby a compressed text is obtained (D2, column 6, lines 33 to 36).

It is irrelevant whether or not the words have been generated by a predictive or an alternative editor. This is clearly confirmed by the description of the present application (see description page 12, line 32 to page 13, line 20). Therefore, the skilled person looking for a solution to said problem would not have to employ any inventive skills to consult D2 which clearly addresses this problem.

The applicant submitted that the skilled person, when applying the teaching of D2 in a system known from D1 to solve the problem of storage space, would simply add the word table to that system and not use it for disambiguation of keystrokes because contrary to the dictionary existing in D1, the word table is missing key stroke information (letter of 30.08.04, page 2, second paragraph). Such combination would including two dictionaries and thus clearly be different from the claimed system.

This view is not accepted because even though disambiguation with a dictionary including key stroke information is less complex, it is obvious for the skilled person that a work table as known from D2 can be used for that purpose. Since the association between keys and characters is predefined and fixed, a keystroke can immediately be translated into the corresponding character strings which in turn can be matched with the word table. It is noted that there are no features in claim 1 which define that the dictionaries include keystroke information. Therefore, the use of a dictionary in the form of the word table as known from D2 is also covered by claim 1.

Therefore, the skilled person would consider a combination of the teaching of documents D1 and D2 whereby the word table of D2 is used to replace the dictionary of D1 and thus would arrive at a system as defined in claim 1.

Therefore, this claim does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT for lack of inventive step of its subject-matter, Article 33(3) PCT.

2. The features of the dependent claims 2 to 19 appears to relate to standard practice in the field of computer technique and/or already to be known from D1 or D2.

Therefore, also these claims do not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.

3. The same conclusions apply to the method claims 20 to 39 because of their analogy to the system claims 1 to 19.